UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,370	02/19/2002	Howard T. Marano	2001P10727 US01	9274

7590   04/19/2004

Elsa Keller, Legal Assistant
Intellectual Property Department
SIEMENS CORPORATION
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER
VAN DOREN, BETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N . 10/007,370	Applicant(s) MARANO, HOWARD T.
	Examin r Beth Van Doren	Art Unit 3623 ᴍᴜ

-- The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appears n the c ver sheet with the correspondenc address --

Peri d f r Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 February 2004</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is

closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage

        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The following is a Final office action in response to the communications received

02/09/04. Claims 1, 5, 8, and 15-18 have been amended. Claims 1-19 are pending in this

application.

Response to Amendment

2.   Applicant's amendment to the abstract is sufficient to overcome the specification

objections set forth in the previous office action.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with regards to Macrae et al. (U.S. 5,826,237) have been

fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that (1)

Macrae et al. discloses a treatment plan being assigned to a patient or client and does not

identify specific entities that perform the tasks, assigning a task to be performed by a

worker, or "applying" received "decision information in assigning the task representative

identifier to the task schedule associated with the particular entity in response to a

predetermined event", (2) Macrae et al. is not concerned with task assignment, (3)

Macrae et al. does not disclose "an identifier representing a task to be performed by an

entity" or assigning such an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task

schedules associated with and accessible by a corresponding plurality of different entities,

(4) Macrae et al. does not disclose providing one or more work lists, as discussed on

application pages 1 and 2, providing an updated task schedule, as discussed on

application page 12, and other features found on pages 10 and 11 of the application, (5)

Macrae et al. does not teach "processing data associated with a task to identify a task

schedule, (6) Macrae et al. does not disclose the limitations of claims 4-7 and 9-14, and

(7) Macrae et al. does not disclose an event for triggering application of the procedure in allocating the task representative identifier to the identified task schedule.

In response to argument (1) of the Applicant, Examiner first points out that claim 1 recites "initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for assigning a task representative identifier to a task schedule associated with a particular entity", "receiving decision information entered via the at least one interface menu", and "applying the received decision information in assigning the task representative identifier to the task schedule associated with the particular entity in response to a predetermined event". These limitations do not specifically require identifying <u>specific</u> entities that perform the tasks or assigning a task to be performed by a worker. Macrae et al. teaches a menu interface displayed to a user (i.e. doctor, lab technicians, medical practitioners, etc.) that allows the user to enter information for assigning an identifier to a schedule associated with an entity (i.e. patient), receiving the information, and applying the information in assigning an identifier to the task schedule in response to a predetermined event. The system of Macrae et al. outlines a treatment plan to be acted on by various medical users of the system. After the plan is outlined, a medical user, such as a lab tech, will enter information into the system concerning work performed, such as a strep test. The results about the decision of the lab tech are entered, applied to the outline, and translated into identifiers that cause branching to occur in the outline. See figures 1, 4, 12, 19, and 31-33, and column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 3, lines 5-15, 20-26, and 40-47, column 6, lines 17-22 and 45-67, column 7, lines 15-25, 30-35, and 53-67, column 17, lines 24-30 and 55-67, and column 18, lines 15-31.

In response to argument (2) of the Applicant, Examiner respectfully disagrees.
Macrae et al. discusses task assignment to the extent that the claims recite aspects of task
assignment through the outlining of a plan and the branching of this plan based on
received decision information. Therefore, some tasks are enacted while others are not
based on the received decision information. If something more specific is meant, it
should be clearly recited in the bodies of the pending claims.

In response to argument (3) of the Applicant, Examiner points out that the
limitations of "an identifier representing a task to be performed by an entity" and
"assigning such an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules
associated with and accessible by a corresponding plurality of different entities" are not
recited in the body of the claim, but rather the preamble. These recitations, therefore, are
not afforded patentable weight. Examiner points out that a preamble is generally not
accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the
intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the
preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able
to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v.
Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

In response to argument (4) of the Applicant, it is noted that the features upon
which applicant relies (i.e., work list features, etc.) are not recited in the rejected claims.
Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the
specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26
USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Examiner suggests positive recitation of these features
in the claims to make sure they receive proper patentable weight.

In response to argument (5) of the Applicant, Examiner respectfully disagrees.

See at least figures 14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6,

lines 45-65, and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein a processor has an outlined

procedure to be followed after receiving the decision information. The outline has

proposed schedule branches that are only enacted based on the received decision

information. For example, if the task is a strep test and the decision information is

negative, the decision information is processed with respect to the task in the outline and

a task schedule that incorporates this representative identifier of negative is followed in

the outline (thus scheduling and following the negative branch and disregarding the

positive branch). The decision information would encompass a broader range of

information than what is translated into the identifier for scheduling purposes.

In response to argument (6) of the Applicant, Applicant's arguments fail to

comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims

define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the

claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. For example, on page 11 of the

response, Applicant asserts that the prior art does not show "the data associated with a

task comprises at least one of (a) a medical procedure identifier for a scheduled

procedure, (b) a time and date of performance of a medical procedure, (c) patient medical

record information, (d) location of performance of a medical procedure, (e) patient type

identifier, (f) patient physical characteristics" without specifically pointing out how this

limitation (which is an exact copy of the claim language) patentably distinguishes the

claim for Macrae et al. Therefore, Examiner respectfully disagrees and reasserts the

rejections set forth below in each instance.

In response to argument (7) of the Applicant, Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Macrae et al. discloses a programmed procedure being follows after the receipt of data,

the receipt of the data being a triggering event for the workflow. The procedure applies

the data to the task schedule and causes branching based on the task character

information. See at least figures 14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-

67, column 6, lines 45-65, and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57. If the Applicant

intends for the triggering event to be something more specific, Examiner suggests

recitation of these features in the claims.

Therefore, the rejections of the previous office action are maintained and

reasserted below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Macrae

et al. (U.S. 5,826,237).

5.   As per claim 1, Macrae et al. teaches a method for assigning an identifier to at

least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding

plurality of different entries, the identifier representing a task to be performed by an

entity, comprising:

a.   initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of

decision information for assigning a task representative identifier to a task

schedule associated with a particular entity (See figures 1, 4, 12, 19, and 31-33,

and column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 3, lines 5-15, 20-26, and 40-47,

column 6, lines 17-22 and 45-67, column 7, lines 15-25, 30-35, and 53-67,

column 17, lines 24-30 and 55-67, and column 18, lines 15-31, wherein a display

of a menu is initiated, the menu allowing a user to enter decision information that

assigns a task character information to a task schedule associated with a user);

b.   receiving decision information entered via the at least one interface menu

(See at least figures 1, 4, 12, 19, and 31-33, and column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, and

column 6, lines 45-65, wherein decision information is received via the interface. See

also figure 14 and 15 and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57); and

c.   applying the received decision information in assigning the task

representative identifier to the task schedule associated with the particular entity

in response to a predetermined event (See at least figures 14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-

33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65, and column 10, lines

28-35 and 44-57, wherein decision information is applied to assign representative

identification information to the task schedule associated with the user in response

to a predetermined event (i.e. an order is performed and decision information is

received from a user and applied to the task schedule)).

6.   As per claim 2, Macrae et al discloses a method wherein the step of initiating

display of at least one interface menu includes initiating display of menu elements

prompting a user to identify at least one of (a) the predetermined event triggering

application of the decision information in assigning the task representative identifier to

the task schedule, (b) a source of decision information, (c) decision information

comprising a procedure for processing data associated with a task to determine a task

schedule for listing the task representative identifier (See at least figures 14, 15, 12, 19,

and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65, and column 10, lines

28-35 and 44-57, wherein a processor has a programmed procedure it follows after

received the decision information which is the manner in which the data associated with

the task is processed. The information determines the schedule by branching based on

the task character information. The task representative identifier is listed in the schedule

display).

7.   As per claim 3, Macrae et al. discloses a method wherein the decision information

comprises a logical procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task

schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier (See at least figures 14, 15,

12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65, and column

10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein a processor has a programmed procedure it follows

after received the decision information which is the manner in which the data associated

with the task is processed. The information determines the schedule by branching based

on the task character information).

8.   As per claim 4, Macrae et al. teaches a method wherein the data associated with a

task comprises at least one of (a) a medical procedure identifier for a scheduled

procedure, (b) a time and date of performance of a medical procedure, (c) patient medical

record information, (d) location of performance of a medical procedure, (e) patient type

identifier, (f) patient physical characteristics (See at least figures 14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-

33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65, and column 10, lines 28-35

and 44-57, wherein the data includes a medical procedure identifier, a time and date of

performance, patient medical information, etc.).

9.   As per claim 5, Macrae et al. discloses a method wherein the entity comprises at

least one of (a) a user, (b) a category of users, (c) one or more users currently designated

to perform a healthcare worker role, and (d) a medical device or system (See figures 1, 4,

12, 19, and 31-33, and column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 3, lines 5-15, 20-26, and

40-47, column 6, lines 17-22 and 45-67, column 7, lines 15-25, 30-35, and 53-67, column

17, lines 24-30 and 55-67, and column 18, lines 15-31, which includes a user).

10.   As per claim 6, Macrae et al. discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein:

        a.   decision information identifies the predetermined event (See at least

figures 14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-

65, and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein the decision information includes

information about the predetermined event); and

        b.   the predetermined event corresponds to at least one of (a) patient

admission, (b) beginning of a medical procedure, (c) end of a medical procedure, (d) a

user defined event based on information acquired (See at least figures 14, 15, 12, 19, and

31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65, and column 10, lines 28-

35 and 44-57, wherein the predetermined event corresponds to at least the beginning/end

of a medical procedure).

11.   As per claim 7, Macrae et al. discloses a method further including applying the

received decision information in prioritizing a plurality of task representative identifiers

associated with a particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering event (See

column 7, lines 45-65, column 9, lines 55-65, column 19, lines 25-45, and column 22,

lines 50-67, wherein the decision information is applied and the scheduled tasks are

executed in order based on the priority of the orderings of the tasks. Based on trigger

events and the task representative identifiers, the tasks can be reordered).

12.   As per claim 8, Macrae et al. teaches a method for assigning an identifier to at

least one of a plurality of task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of

different entities, the identifier representing a task to be performed by an entity,

comprising:

       a.   initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of

decision information for assigning a task representative identifier to a task schedule

associated with a particular entity and accessible by the particular entity (See figures 1, 4,

12, 19, and 31-33, and column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 3, lines 5-15, 20-26, and

40-47, column 6, lines 17-22 and 45-67, column 7, lines 15-25, 30-35, and 53-67, column

17, lines 24-30 and 55-67, and column 18, lines 15-31, wherein a display of a menu is

initiated, the menu allowing a user to enter and access decision information that assigns a

task character information to a task schedule associated with a user), the decision

information including:

              i.   a procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task

              schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier (See at least figures

              14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65,

              and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein a processor has a programmed

              procedure it follows after received the decision information which is the manner

              in which the data associated with the task is processed. The information

determines the schedule by branching based on the task character information),

and

ii.   an event for triggering application of the procedure in allocating the task

representative identifier to the identified task schedule (See at least figures 14, 15,

12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65, and

column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein a processor has a programmed

procedure it follows after receiving data, the receipt of the data being a triggering

event for the workflow. The procedure applies the data to the task schedule and

causes branching based on the task character information);

b.   receiving decision information entered via the at least one interface menu

(See at least figures 1, 4, 12, 19, and 31-33, and column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67,

and column 6, lines 45-65, wherein decision information is received via the

interface. See also figure 14 and 15 and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57); and

c.   applying the received decision information in assigning the task

representative identifier to the task schedule associated with the particular entity

in response to occurrence of the triggering event (See at least figures 14, 15, 12,

19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65, and

column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein decision information is applied to

assign representative identification information to the task schedule associated

with the user in response to a predetermined event (i.e. an order is performed and

decision information is received from a user and applied to the task schedule)).

13.   As per claim 9, Macrae et al. teaches a method wherein the data associated with a

task comprises at least one of (a) a medical procedure identifier for a scheduled

procedure, (b) a time and date of performance of a medical procedure, (c) patient medical

record information, (d) location of performance of a medical procedure, (e) patient type

identifier, (f) patient physical characteristics (See at least figures 14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-

33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65, and column 10, lines 28-35

and 44-57, wherein the data includes a medical procedure identifier, a time and date of

performance, patient medical information, etc.).

14.   As per claim 10, Macrae et al. discloses a method wherein the triggering event

corresponds to at least one of (a) patient admission, (b) beginning of a medical procedure,

(c) end of a medical procedure, (d) a user defined event based on information acquired

(See at least figures 14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column

6, lines 45-65, and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein the predetermined event

corresponds to at least the beginning/end of a medical procedure).

15.   As per claim 11, Macrae et al. discloses a method further including acquiring the

data associated with a task (See at least figures 14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines

35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65, and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein

data associated with the task is acquired and processed).

16.   As per claim 12, Macrae et al. teaches a method wherein:

    a.   the procedure conditions allocation of the task to the task schedule

    associated with the particular entity upon coincidence of a plurality of

    occurrences (See figure 1 and column 7, lines 43-62, wherein the chances of the

    occurrences are used in the schedule); and

    b.   further including acquiring data to identify the coincidence of the plurality

    of occurrences (See figure 1 and column 7, lines 43-62).

17.   As per claim 13, Macrae et al. discloses a method wherein:

a.   the triggering event is conditioned upon coincidence of a plurality of

occurrences (See figure 1 and column 7, lines 43-62, wherein the chances of the

occurrences are used in the schedule. The receipt of the data is a triggering event

for the workflow and the branches are conditioned using the chance of

occurrence. The procedure applies the data to the task schedule and causes

branching based on the task character information); and

b.   further including acquiring data to identify the coincidence of the plurality

of circumstances (See at least figure 1 and column 7, lines 43-62).

18.   As per claim 14, Macrae at al. discloses a method further including applying the

received decision information in removing a task representative identifier from the task

schedule associated with the particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering

event (See at least figures 14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67,

column 6, lines 45-65, and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein a processor has a

programmed procedure it follows after receiving data, the receipt of the data being a

triggering event for the workflow. The procedure applies the data to the task schedule

and causes branching based on the task character information. The task representative

identifiers associated with the not chosen branch are removed from the schedule).

19.   As per claim 15, Macrae et al. teaches a method for providing a user interface for

assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules

associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, the identifier representing a

task to be performed by an entity, comprising:

a.   in response to a user command,

    i. initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for assigning a task representative identifier to a task schedule associated with a particular entity (See figures 1, 4, 12, 19, and 31-33, and column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 3, lines 5-15, 20-26, and 40-47, column 6, lines 17-22 and 45-67, column 7, lines 15-25, 30-35, and 53-67, column 17, lines 24-30 and 55-67, and column 18, lines 15-31, wherein a display of a menu is initiated, the menu allowing a user to enter decision information that assigns a task character information to a task schedule associated with a user); and

    ii. initiating display of an updated task schedule associated with the particular entry, the updated task schedule being generated in response to applying received decision information in assigning the task representative identifier to the task schedule associated with the particular entity in response to occurrence of a predetermined event (See column 7, lines 45-65, column 9, lines 55-65, column 19, lines 25-45, and column 22, lines 50-67, wherein the decision information is applied and the scheduled tasks are executed. Based on received decision information input by the user, the schedule can be updated. The new generated schedule, containing the task representative identifier, etc. is displayed updated with the merging, backing up, etc.)

20.   As per claim 16, Macrae et al. discloses a method for providing a user interface supporting assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, the identifier representing a task to be performed by an entity, comprising:

    a. in response to a user a command,

i. initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of

decision information for assigning a task representative identifier to a task

schedule associated with a particular entity and accessible by the particular entity

(See figures 1, 4, 12, 19, and 31-33, and column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column

3, lines 5-15, 20-26, and 40-47, column 6, lines 17-22 and 45-67, column 7, lines

15-25, 30-35, and 53-67, column 17, lines 24-30 and 55-67, and column 18, lines

15-31, wherein a display of a menu is initiated, the menu allowing a user to enter

decision information that assigns a task character information to a task schedule

associated with a user), the decision information including,

ii. a procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task

schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier (See at least figures

14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65,

and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein a processor has a programmed

procedure it follows after received the decision information which is the manner

in which the data associated with the task is processed. The information

determines the schedule by branching based on the task character information),

and

iii. an event for triggering application of the procedure in allocating the

task representative identifier to the identified task schedule (See at least figures

14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65,

and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein a processor has a programmed

procedure it follows after receiving data, the receipt of the data being a triggering

event for the workflow. The procedure applies the data to the task schedule and

causes branching based on the task character information); and

b. initiating display of an updated task schedule associated with the particular

entity, the updated task schedule being generated in response to applying received

decision information in assigning the task representative identifier to the task

schedule associated with the particular entity in response to occurrence of the

triggering event (See at least column 7, lines 45-65, column 9, lines 55-65,

column 19, lines 25-45, and column 22, lines 50-67, wherein the decision

information is applied and the scheduled tasks are executed. Based on received

decision information input by the user, a triggering event occurs and the schedule

can be updated).

21.   As per claim 17, Macrae et al. teaches a method for assigning an identifier to at

least one of a plurality of task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of

different entities, the identifier representing a task to be performed by an entity,

comprising:

> a.   initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of
>
> decision information for selectively assigning a task representative identifier to at
>
> least one of a plurality of task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality
>
> of different entities (See figures 1, 4, 12, 19, and 31-33, and column 2, lines 35-49
>
> and 59-67, column 3, lines 5-15, 20-26, and 40-47, column 6, lines 17-22 and 45-
>
> 67, column 7, lines 15-25, 30-35, and 53-67, column 17, lines 24-30 and 55-67,
>
> and column 18, lines 15-31, wherein a display of a menu is initiated, the menu
>
> allowing a user to enter decision information that assigns a task character

information to a task schedule associated with a user), the decision information

comprising:

    i. a procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task

schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier (See at least figures

14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65,

and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein a processor has a programmed

procedure it follows after received the decision information which is the manner

in which the data associated with the task is processed. The information

determines the schedule by branching based on the task character information),

and

    ii. an event for triggering application of the procedure in allocating the

task representative identifier to the identified task schedule (See at least figures

14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65,

and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein a processor has a programmed

procedure it follows after receiving data, the receipt of the data being a triggering

event for the workflow. The procedure applies the data to the task schedule and

causes branching based on the task character information);

b.   receiving decision information entered via the at least one interface menu

(See at least figures 1, 4, 12, 19, and 31-33, and column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67,

and column 6, lines 45-65, wherein decision information is received via the

interface. See also figure 14 and 15 and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57); and

c.   applying the received decision information in selectively assigning the

task representative identifier to the at least one of the plurality of task schedules

associated with the corresponding plurality of different entities in response to

occurrence of the triggering event (See at least figures 14, 15, 12, 19, and 31-33,

column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65, and column 10, lines 28-

35 and 44-57, wherein decision information is applied to assign representative

identification information to the task schedule associated with the user in response

to a predetermined event (i.e. an order is performed and decision information is

received from a user and applied to the task schedule)).

22.   As per claim 18, Macrae et al. discloses a system for assigning an identifier to at

least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding

plurality of different entities, the identifier representing a task to be performed by an

entity, comprising:

    a.   a display processor for initiating display of at least one interface menu

    supporting user entry of decision information for assigning a task representative

    identifier to a task schedule associated with a particular entity (See figures 1, 4,

    12, 19, and 31-33, and column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 3, lines 5-15, 20-

    26, and 40-47, column 6, lines 17-22 and 45-67, column 7, lines 15-25, 30-35,

    and 53-67, column 17, lines 24-30 and 55-67, and column 18, lines 15-31,

    wherein a display of a menu is initiated, the menu allowing a user to enter

    decision information that assigns a task character information to a task schedule

    associated with a user);

    b.   an interface processor for receiving decision information entered via the at

least one interface menu (See at least figures 1, 4, 12, 19, and 31-33, and column 2, lines

35-49 and 59-67, and column 6, lines 45-65, wherein decision information is received via

the interface. See also figure 14 and 15 and column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57); and

      c.   a decision processor applying the received decision information in

assigning the task representative identifier to the task schedule associated with the

particular entity in response to a predetermined event (See at least figures 14, 15,

12, 19, and 31-33, column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 6, lines 45-65, and

column 10, lines 28-35 and 44-57, wherein decision information is applied to

assign representative identification information to the task schedule associated

with the user in response to a predetermined event (i.e. an order is performed and

decision information is received from a user and applied to the task schedule)).

23.   As per claim 19, Macrae et al. discloses a computer program embodied within a

computer readable medium using the method of claim 1 (See figures 1, 4, 12, 19, and 31-

33, and column 2, lines 35-49 and 59-67, column 3, lines 5-15, 20-26, and 40-47, column

6, lines 17-22 and 45-67, column 7, lines 15-25, 30-35, and 53-67, column 17, lines 24-

30 and 55-67, and column 18, lines 15-31).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than

SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (703) 305-

3882. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bvd
April 5, 2004

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600